

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 7, 14 and 21 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

The Examiner has maintained all of the prior art rejections contained in the previous Office Action dated August 2, 2004.

Applicants respectfully traverse all these rejections.

In Applicants' response filed November 2, 2004, it was argued that none of the cited references teaches, mentions or suggests that the first drive signal (S4 of Fig. 3) has substantially the same pulse width as that of the pulse signal (S3 of Fig. 3). In fact, **APA** discloses that the first control signal S4 "has a pulse width smaller that of the pulse signal S3 by the delay time $td1$." This is in contrast to the present invention as shown in Fig. 7, in which the first control signal S14 has the same pulse width as that of the pulse signal S3.

Furthermore, as shown in Fig. 18b, **Bridge** (previously applied) generates a signal G1 having a pulse width smaller than that of an input signal IN. **Nishimaki** (previously applied) cannot generate a pulse signal having the same pulse width as that of the PWM signal because the pulse signals SH and SL, which are generated from the output signals of the NAND circuits 312 and 322 via the inverters 324, 325 and 327, are cross-coupled to the NAND circuits 312 and 322 that receive the PWM signal.

The Examiner has stated:

Therefore, the limitation that the first drive signal has substantially the same pulse width as that of an input pulse signal is given no patentable weight since there is no standard or values or range of values indicating or defining how close pulse widths need to be before they are "substantially the same". Resultantly, the examiner considers any two pulse widths to be "substantially the same" since there is no standard by which to base the determination.

Accordingly, claims 1, 7, 14 and 21 have been amended by deleting the term "substantially" from the claims, and the prior art rejections should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-21, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/624,644**
Response to Office Action dated January 10, 2005

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

William L. Brooks
William L. Brooks

Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/mla
Atty. Docket No. **030879**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

H:\HOME\etitia\WLB\03\030879\amendment apr 2005